REMARKS

In the telephone interviews of March 4-5, 2004, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed some necessary amendments to the specification. Due to time constraints, the Examiner did not receive an amendment satisfying his objections to the specification before he had to mail the Notice of Allowance. The Examiner indicated he would amend the specification by Examiner's Amendment. However, the Applicant does not see an Examiner's Amendment attached to the Notice of Allowance. The Applicant believes that the specification is still in an objected-to state. Accordingly, the Applicant re-submits the Applicant's previously proposed amendment as an Amendment After Allowance under 37 C.F.R. § 1.312, amending the specification and the drawings to correct the Examiner's objections. It is hoped that the Examiner will enter the amendment.

COMMENT ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

In allowing the claims, the Examiner discussed claim 3 specifically, and made general references to independent claims 1, 43, and 51. But claim 3 is a method claim, whereas claim 43 is a claim to a computer-readable medium and claim 51 is a system claim. In addition, claim 1 is of different scope than claim 3. Independent claim 1 is therefore allowable for reasons other than those stated. In addition, many of the features of claim 1 are presented in dependent claims 2, 4-31, 44-50, and 52-67, and the dependent claims are therefore independently allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Ariel S. Rogson

Reg. No. 43,054

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C. 1030 SW Morrison Street Portland, OR 97205 503-222-3613

Customer No. 20575

HEREBY CERTIFY THAT
HIS CORRESPONDENCE S
BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE
JNITED STATES POSTAL
SERVICE AS FIRST CLASS
MALL IN AN ENVELOPE
JODGESSED TO:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
AND TRADEMARKS WASHINGTON
C.C. 20231

MAIL STOP SEVE FOR PATENTS BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

BOX COMMISSIONER
FOR TRADEMARKS 2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE ARLINGTON, VA 22202-3513
ON: 27 May 2 974



